

*ALMOST FREE GROUPS BELOW
THE FIRST FIX POINT EXIST*
SH523

SAHARON SHELAH

Institute of Mathematics
The Hebrew University
Jerusalem, Israel

Rutgers University
Department of Mathematics
New Brunswick, NJ USA

Anotated Content

§1 - λ -free does not imply free for $\lambda < \text{first fix point}$

[We represent material from [MgSh:204], assuming knowledge of [Sh:g, Ch.II].
Just enough to make §2 intelligible.]

§2 - Nicely compact sets and non-reflection

[We answer a question of Foreman and Magidor on reflection of stationary subsets of $\mathcal{S}_{<\aleph_2}(\lambda) = \{a \subseteq \lambda : |a| < \aleph_2\}$. We answer a question of Mekler Eklof on the closure operations of the incompactness spectrum.]

§3 - NPT is not transitive

[We prove the consistency of $NPT(\lambda, \mu) + NPT(\mu, \kappa) \not\Rightarrow NPT(\lambda, \kappa)$].

Research supported by German-Israeli Foundation for Scientific Research & Development Grant
No. G-294.081.06/93

Typeset by $\mathcal{A}\mathcal{M}\mathcal{S}$ -TEX

§1 λ -FREE DOES NOT IMPLY FREE FOR $\lambda < \text{FIRST FIX POINT}$

1.1 Definition. $NPT(\lambda, \kappa)$ means that there is a family $\{A_i : i < \lambda\}$ of subsets of λ , $|A_i| \leq \kappa$, the family has no transversal but for $\alpha < \lambda$ we have $\{A_i : i < \alpha\}$ has a transversal. Let $PT(\lambda, \kappa)$ be $\neg NPT(\lambda, \kappa)$.

Now by [Sh:161], $NPT(\lambda, \aleph_0)$ is equivalent to the existence of λ -free not λ^+ -free abelian group. Also “canonical” examples of “incompactness” are given there.

Magidor Shelah [MgSh:204] proved

1.2 Theorem (ZFC). *If λ is smaller than the first $\alpha = \aleph_\alpha > \aleph_0$ then there is a λ -free not free abelian group.*

This was done by providing an induction step from incompactness in κ , $\aleph_0 < \kappa = \text{cf}(\kappa) < \aleph_\kappa$ to incompactness in some $\lambda \geq \aleph_\kappa$, in fact $\aleph_{\kappa+1}$.

However, subsequently, to answer questions of Eklof and Mekler (in 2.2, 2.3) and of Magidor and Foreman (in 2.8), we do more.

Explanation of the History: Generally on the history of this problem see the book of Eklof and Mekler [EM]. The existence of such group for $\lambda = \aleph_{\omega+1}$ is proved in [Sh:108] assuming $\aleph_\omega$ strong limit or just $2^{\aleph_0} < \aleph_\omega$; this is based on investigating $I[\aleph_{\omega+1}]$ (where for a regular uncountable λ ,

$I[\lambda] = \{S \subseteq \lambda : \text{for some club } E \text{ of } \lambda \text{ and } \bar{a} = \langle a_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda \rangle \text{ we have } a_\alpha \subseteq \alpha, \text{otp}(a_\alpha) < \alpha \text{ and } \alpha \in S \cap E \Rightarrow \alpha = \sup(a_\alpha)\}$), see on it [Sh:g, AG §1]. In the earlier version of [MgSh:204], for $\lambda > \text{cf}(\lambda) = \kappa$ when $2^\kappa < \lambda$ we replace a division to cases defined from properties $I[\lambda]$ by one defined from $\bar{f} = \langle f_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda^+ \rangle <_I$ -increasing cofinal in $\prod_{i < \kappa} \lambda_i / I$.

It is shown there that the set of bad (for $\bar{f}$) ordinals $< \aleph_{\kappa+1}$ is “small”, (but assuming something like $2^\kappa < \lambda$, then an example in λ is gotten from one on κ^+ . In the present version of [MgSh:204] this was eliminated by showing: for good $\delta < \lambda$ there is a club of good ordinals $< \delta$ (for $\bar{f}$); and similarly for bad (we ignore ordinals of small cofinality).

In this section we represent analyses from [MgSh:204] needed in §2; it is organized around the proof of

1.3 Lemma. *If $NPT(\kappa, \theta)$, and $\kappa \geq \theta = \text{cf}(\theta)$ then $NPT(\kappa^{+(\kappa+1)}, \theta)$.*

Remark. 1) Similarly NPT_I , see on it [Sh:355, §6] (for I an ideal on θ extending J_θ^{bd}).

Till end of the proof of 1.2 we make:

1.4 Convention. κ is a fixed regular cardinal. λ is a cardinal $> \kappa$ of cofinality κ .

(For proving 1.2, we need just $\lambda = \aleph_\kappa$, but latter we will be interested in other values too). J denotes ideals on κ extending $J_\kappa^{bd} = \{A \subseteq \kappa : A \text{ bounded}\}$.

D, E denotes filters on κ containing the co-bounded subsets of λ .

The rest of the section proves 1.3.

1.5 Claim. Suppose $\lambda = \kappa^{+\kappa}$, $\mu = \lambda^+$; $J = J_\kappa^{bd}$, then there are $\langle \lambda_i : i < \kappa \rangle$, $\langle f_\alpha : \alpha < \mu \rangle$ such that the following holds:

- (*) (a) $\langle \lambda_i : i < \kappa \rangle$ strictly increasing sequence of regular cardinals $> \kappa^+$ with limit λ ,
- (b) for $\alpha < \mu$, $f_\alpha \in \Pi \lambda_i$, $[\alpha < \beta < \mu \Rightarrow f_\alpha <_J f_\beta]$,
- (c) $\left(\forall f \in \prod_{i < \kappa} \lambda_i \right) (\exists \alpha < \mu) [f <_J f_\alpha]$,
- (d) $\mu = \text{cf}(\mu) > \lambda$ (what is trivial here),
- (e) J is an ideal on κ containing J_κ^{bd} .

Proof. By [Sh:355, 1.5].

* * *

For awhile (till we finish proving 1.15) we shall assume (*) of 1.5.

1.6 Context. (*) of 1.5.

Let us quote [Sh:355, 1.2], for the reader's convenience.

1.7 Claim. Assume $\text{cf}(\delta) > \kappa^+$, I is an ideal on κ and suppose $\langle f_\alpha : \alpha < \delta \rangle$ is a $<_I$ -increasing sequence of members of ${}^\kappa \text{Ord}$. Then exactly one of the following holds:

- (i) for some ultrafilter D on κ disjoint from I we have:
 - (*) $_D$ there are sets $s_i \subseteq \text{Ord}$, $|s_i| \leq \kappa$ and $\langle \alpha_\zeta : \zeta < \text{cf}(\delta) \rangle$ increasing continuous with limit δ , such that for each $\zeta < \text{cf}(\delta)$ for some $h_\zeta \in \prod_{i < \kappa} s_i$ we have:

$$f_{\alpha_\zeta}/D < h_\zeta/D < f_{\alpha_{\zeta+1}}/D$$
- (ii) (**) $_I$ some $f \in {}^\kappa \text{Ord}$ is a $<_I$ -eub of $\langle f_\alpha : \alpha < \delta \rangle$,
 (i.e. f satisfies $(\alpha) + (\beta)$ below) and (γ) holds:
 - (α) for $\alpha < \delta$, $f_\alpha <_I f$
 - (β) if $g \in {}^\kappa \text{Ord}$, $g <_I f$ then for some α , $g <_I f_\alpha$ and
 - (γ) $\text{cf}[f(i)] > \kappa$ for $i < \kappa$
- (iii) condition (i) fails and
 - (***) $_I$ for some unbounded $A \subseteq \delta$ and $t_\alpha \subseteq \kappa$ for $\alpha \in A$ and $g \in {}^\kappa \text{Ord}$ we have:
 - (α) for $\alpha < \beta$ in A , $t_\beta \setminus t_\alpha \in I$ but $t_\alpha \setminus t_\beta \notin I$
 (i.e. $\langle t_\alpha/I : \alpha \in A \rangle$ is strictly decreasing in $\mathcal{P}(\kappa)/I$)
 - (β) $t_\alpha = \{i < \kappa : f_\alpha(i) \leq g(i)\}$.

1.8 Claim. 1) For $\langle f_\alpha : \alpha < \delta \rangle, \kappa, I$ as in the hypothesis of Claim 1.3 such that $cf(\delta) > \kappa^+$, the following are equivalent:

- (a) there are $A \subseteq \delta$ unbounded, and $s_\alpha \in I$ for $\alpha \in A$ such that:
 $\langle f_\alpha(i) : \alpha \in A, i \in \kappa \setminus s_\alpha \rangle$ is strictly increasing in α for each $i < \kappa$
- (b) $(**)I$ of Claim 1.3 holds for some f and

$$\{i < \kappa : cf[f(i)] \neq cf(\delta)\} \in I$$

(note: f/I is unique as a $<_I$ -lub of $\langle f_\alpha : \alpha < \delta \rangle$).

2) If $cf(\delta) > \text{gen}(I)$, in clause (a) above without loss of generality $s_\alpha = s$ for $\alpha \in A$; if $I = J_\kappa^{bd}$ without loss of generality $s_\alpha = s = [i(*), \kappa)$ for some fixed $i(*)$.

1.9 Definition. We define (for $\bar{f}$ and J, κ, λ, μ):

1) S^{gd} is the set of $\bar{f}$ -good ordinals. An ordinal δ is weakly $\bar{f}$ -good if δ is a limit ordinal, $\delta < \ell g(\bar{f})$ is of cofinality $> \kappa$ but $< \lambda$ such that for some $t \subseteq \kappa$, $t \notin J$ and for some unbounded $A \subseteq \delta$ and $\langle s_\alpha : \alpha \in A \rangle$ such that $s_\alpha \in J$ and for each $i < \kappa$, $\langle f_\alpha(i) : \alpha \in A, i \in t \setminus s_\alpha \rangle$ is strictly increasing (we may say δ is $\bar{f}$ -good by t); so $\bar{f} \upharpoonright \delta$ has a $<_J$ -eub (see below) $f_\delta^*, f_\delta^*(i) = \sup\{f_\alpha(i) : \alpha \in A \text{ and } i \in s_\alpha\}$. An ordinal δ is $\bar{f}$ -good if we could have $t = \kappa$.

2) S^{bd} , a set of bad points for $\bar{f}$, is the set of limit ordinals $\delta < \ell g(\bar{f})$ of cofinality $> \kappa$ but $< \lambda$ such that $\bar{f} \upharpoonright \delta$ satisfies $(**)J$ of Claim [Sh:355, 1.2] - for some f_δ^* (i.e. $\bar{f} \upharpoonright \delta$ has as a $<_J$ -eub f_δ^* (i.e. $<_J$ -exact upper bound, this means (here): $\alpha < \delta \Rightarrow f_\alpha <_J f_\delta$ and $g <_J f_\delta \Rightarrow \bigvee_{\alpha < \delta} g <_J f_\delta$) such that $\{i : cf[f_\delta^*(i)] \leq \kappa\} \in J$),

but $\delta \notin S^{gd}$; without loss of generality $f_\delta^* \in \prod_{i < \kappa} \lambda_i$ (as $f_\delta^* \leq_J f_\delta$).

3) S^{ch} , a set of δ chaotic points for $\bar{f}$, is the set of limit ordinals $\delta < \ell g(\bar{f})$ of cofinality $> \kappa$ but $< \lambda$ such that:

- (a) $\bar{f} \upharpoonright \delta$ satisfies $(*)_{D_\delta}$ of Claim [Sh:345, 1.2] i.e. for some ultrafilter D_δ on κ disjoint to J and $\langle a_i : i < \kappa \rangle$, a_i a set of $\leq \kappa$ ordinals, for every $i < \delta$ for some $j < \delta$ (but $> i$) and $g \in \prod_{i < \kappa} a_i$ we have $f_i/D < g/D < f_j/D$

or

- (b) $\bar{f} \upharpoonright \delta$ satisfies $(***)I$ of Claim [Sh:355, 1.2(iii)]; (i.e. for some A, g we have $A \subseteq \delta$ unbounded, $g \in {}^\kappa \text{Ord}$ and $\langle \{i : f_\alpha(i) \leq g(i)\} / J : \alpha \in A \rangle$ is strictly decreasing in $\mathcal{P}(\kappa)/J$. (Hence $cf(\delta) \leq 2^\kappa$ and if J is a maximal ideal, this does not occur).

4) $S^{wg}(\bar{f})$ is the set of weakly good $\delta < \mu$ satisfying $\delta \notin S^{ch}$; S^{vbd} is the set $S^{bd} \setminus S^{wg} \setminus S^{ch}$.

1.10 Remark. 1) For the specific $J = J_\kappa^{bd}$ we could redefine S^{gd} as follows: for some unbounded $A \subseteq \delta$ and $i(*) < \kappa$ for $\alpha \in A$, for each $i \in (i(*), \kappa)$ $\langle f_\alpha(i) : \alpha \in A \rangle$ is strictly increasing. We use: J is generated by a family of $< cf(\delta)$ subsets of κ .

2) More accurately, we should have written $S^{gd}[\bar{f}]$ or even $S_J^{gd}[\bar{f}, \lambda]$, (as κ can be

reconstructed), similarly for bd and ch .

3) gd, bd, ch stands for good, bad, chaotic, respectively.

1.11 Fact. 1) $\langle S^{gd}, S^{bd}, S^{ch} \rangle$ is a partition of $\{\delta < \ell g(\bar{f}) : \kappa < cf(\delta) < \lambda\}$. Also $\langle S^{wgd}, S^{vbd}, S^{sch} \rangle$ is a partition of that set.

2) $\delta \in S^{gd} \cup S^{bd}$ iff $\bar{f} \restriction \delta$ satisfies $(*)_I$ of Claim [Sh:355, 1.2], for $I = J$; i.e. $\bar{f} \restriction \delta$ has a $<_J$ -eub.

3) $S^{gd} \subseteq S^{wg}$ and $S^{vbd} \subseteq S^{bd}$.

Proof. If $\delta \in S^{gd}$, then $\bar{f} \restriction \delta$ satisfies $(*)_I$ of Claim [Sh:355, 1.2] (for $I = J$), by 1.9. Now Part 2) holds by the definition of S^{bd} . Now Part (1) is immediate by Claim [Sh:345, 1.2] (and Definition 1.9).

2), 3) Easy, too. $\square_{1.11}$

1.12 Claim. 1) If $\delta \in S^{bd}$ then letting $\lambda_i^\delta = cf[f_\delta^*(i)]$ (see 1.9(2)), we have:

- (i) $\{i : \lambda_i^\delta \leq \kappa \text{ or } \lambda_i^\delta > cf(\delta)\} \in J$ (so without loss of generality it is empty)
- (ii) $\lambda_i^\delta < \lambda_i$ and
- (iii) $(\prod_{i < \kappa} \lambda_i^\delta, <_J)$ has true cofinality $cf(\delta)$ and
- (iv) for no λ' is $\{i : \lambda_i^\delta \neq \lambda'\} \in J$
- (v) If δ is not weakly good, then for every λ' we have $\{i : \lambda_i^\delta = \lambda'\} \in J$
- (vi) for every $\lambda' \neq cf(\delta)$ we have $\{i : \lambda_i^\delta = \lambda'\} \in J$.

2) If J is θ -complete, $\lambda = \chi^{+\zeta}$, $\zeta \leq \theta$ a limit ordinal and $\kappa \leq \chi$, then:

- (i) $\delta \in S^{gd} \Rightarrow \{i < \kappa : \lambda_i^\delta \neq cf(\delta)\} \in J$.
- (ii) $\delta \in S^{vd} \Rightarrow \{i < \kappa : \lambda_i^\delta \geq \chi\} \in J$.
- (iii) $\delta \in S^{wg} \Rightarrow \{i < \kappa : \lambda_i^\delta \geq \chi, \lambda_i^\delta \neq cf(\delta)\} \in J$.
- (iv) $cf(\delta) \geq \chi$ & $\delta \in S^{wg} \setminus S^{gd} \Rightarrow \{i < \kappa : \lambda_i^\delta \geq \chi \text{ and } \lambda_i^\delta = cf(\delta)\} \in J^+$.

3) If J is θ -complete, $\zeta \leq \theta$ (a limit ordinal) and $\lambda = \kappa^{+\zeta}$ then $S^{bd} = \emptyset$.

Proof. 1) The first phrase holds as f_δ^* is $<_J$ -exact upper bound of $\bar{f} \restriction \delta$ (see Claim [Sh:355, 1.2]). For the rest see [Sh:355, 1.6].

2) Suppose $\delta \in S^{bd}$ is not weakly good and $t =: \{i : \lambda_i^\delta > \chi\}$ is not in J ; as $\delta \in S^{bd}$ trivially $\{i : \lambda_i^\delta > cf(\delta)\} \in J$, so $t_1 =: \{i : \chi < \lambda_i^\delta \leq cf(\delta)\}$ is not in J . As $cf(\delta) < \chi^{+\zeta}$, $\zeta \leq \theta$, the set $\{\sigma : \chi \leq \sigma = cf(\sigma) < \chi^{+\zeta}\}$ has $< |\zeta| \leq \theta$ members but J is θ -complete, hence for some $s \subseteq t_1$, $s \notin J$ and $\langle \lambda_i^\delta : i \in s \rangle$ is constant, say λ^* , now also $(\prod_{i \in s} \lambda_i^\delta, <_J)$ has true cofinality $cf(\delta)$ (by 1.12(1)(iii)), but this implies δ is

weakly $\bar{f}$ -good by “ $\Leftarrow$ ” of [Sh:355, 1.6(1)]. So we have proved (ii). For (i), (iii), (iv) the proof is similar. (In fact for clause (i) the assumption of part (2) is not needed).

3) If $\delta \in S^{bd}$, by 1.12(2)(i) we have $\{i < \kappa : \lambda_i^\delta > \kappa\} \in J$, so one of the clauses of Definition 1.9(2) fails by (ii), (iii) of part (2) of our Claim, so $\delta \notin S^{bd}$, contradiction.

$\square_{1.12}$

1.13 Claim. If $\delta \in S^{gd}$, then for some club C of δ we have:

$$\alpha \in C \ \& \ cf(\alpha) > \kappa \Rightarrow \alpha \in S^{gd}.$$

Similarly for S^{wgd} (by t).

Proof. Straightforward by its definition.

1.14 Claim. If $\delta \in S^{ch}$, then for some club C of δ

$$\alpha \in C \ \& \ cf(\alpha) > \kappa \Rightarrow \alpha \in S^{ch}.$$

Proof. If $\delta \in S^{ch}$, then

Case a: For some ultrafilter D on κ disjoint to J (say D_δ) and club C of δ , there are $\langle g_\alpha : \alpha \in C \rangle$ such that:

- (a) for $\alpha < \beta$ in C we have $f_\alpha/D < g_\alpha/D < f_\beta/D$
- (b) for each $i < \kappa$ the set $s_i = \{g_\alpha(i) : \alpha \in C\}$ has power $\leq \kappa$.

Now for every $\delta' \in C$ such that $\delta' = \sup(\delta' \cap C)$ and $cf(\delta') > \kappa$ clearly $\langle g_\alpha : \alpha \in C \cap \delta' \rangle, C \cap \delta', \langle s_i : i < \kappa \rangle$ witness that $\langle f_\alpha : \alpha < \delta' \rangle$ also satisfies $(*)_D$ of [Sh:355, Claim 1.2], hence $\delta' \in S^{ch}$.

Case b: (Not case (a)). (See 1.9(3)). Also trivial proof. $\square_{1.14}$

1.15 Claim. For every regular $\chi, \kappa < \chi < \lambda, S_\chi^{gd} =: \{\delta \in S^{gd} : cf(\delta) = \chi\}$ is stationary.

Proof. Suppose C^* is a club of μ . We choose by induction on $\zeta < \chi$, $\alpha_\zeta, g_\zeta, s_\zeta$ such that:

- (1) $\alpha_\zeta \in C^*$
- (2) $\bigcup_{\xi < \zeta} \alpha_\xi < \alpha_\zeta$
- (3) $g_\zeta \in \prod_{i < \kappa} \lambda_i, g_\zeta(i) =: \sup \{f_{\alpha_\xi}(i) + 1 : \xi < \zeta\}$
- (4) $s_\zeta \in J$
- (5) $i \in \kappa \setminus s_\zeta \Rightarrow g_\zeta(i) < f_{\alpha_\zeta}(i)$.

In stage ζ , first define g_ζ by (3) then find $\beta_\zeta < \mu$ such that $g_\zeta <_J f_{\beta_\zeta}$ (possible as $\langle \lambda_j : j < \kappa \rangle$ is the $<_J$ -eub of $\langle f_\alpha : \alpha < \mu \rangle$) then choose $\alpha_\zeta, \beta_\zeta \cup \bigcup_{\xi < \zeta} \alpha_\xi < \alpha_\zeta \in C^*$ (possible as $|\zeta| < \lambda$, C^* unbounded in μ). Lastly choose s_ζ to satisfy (5) by the definition of $<_J$. Clearly (1)-(5) holds.

Let $\delta = \bigcup_{\zeta < \mu} \alpha_\zeta$, clearly $\delta \in C^*$ (being closed) and $cf(\delta) = \chi$ and clearly $\delta \in S_\chi^{gd}$.

[Note: if $gen(J) < \chi$, as $\chi = cf(\chi)$ for some $t \in J$, $\{\zeta < \mu : s_\zeta \subseteq t\}$ is unbounded in χ . Also it is natural to deduce it from the existence of a stationary $S \subseteq \{\delta < \mu : cf(\delta) = \chi\}, S \in I[\mu]$ (see [Sh:420, §1]).]

We shall not use

1.16 Lemma. *Suppose $\lambda = \kappa^{+\kappa}$, $\langle \lambda_i : i < \kappa \rangle, \mu, J$ are as in $(*)$ of 1.5 and in addition $S^{bd} = \emptyset$. Let $C^* = \{\delta < \lambda^+ : \delta \text{ divisible by } \lambda^2\}$. Then we can find $\langle \alpha_{i,j}^\delta : \delta \in C^* \cap S^{gd}, i < cf(\delta), j < \kappa \rangle$ such that:*

- (a) $\alpha_{i,j}^\delta < \delta$ (and, if you want, $\langle \alpha_{i,j}^\delta : i < cf(\delta) \rangle$ is increasing continuous with limit δ , $\langle \alpha_{i,j}^\delta : j < \kappa \rangle$ increasing with j).
- (b) for every $\delta(*) < \lambda^+$ we can find $\langle C^\delta, s_i^\delta : \delta \in \delta(*) \cap C^* \cap S^{gd}, i < cf(\delta) \rangle$ such that:
 - (α) C^δ a club of $cf(\delta)$
 - (β) $s_i^\delta \in J$
 - (γ) $\langle \{\alpha_{i,j}^\delta : i \in C^\delta, j \notin s_i^\delta\} : \delta \in \delta(*) \cap C^* \cap S^{gd} \rangle$ are pairwise disjoint.

This we refer to [MgSh:204], anyhow see proof of 2.6.

§2 NICELY COMPACT SET AND NON-REFLECTION

This section answers the following two questions.

One question of Foreman and Magidor asks for consistency of the following reflection principle:

- (*) $_{\lambda}$ if $S \subseteq \mathcal{S}_{<\aleph_2}(\lambda)$ is a stationary set (of $\mathcal{S}_{<\aleph_2}(\lambda)$, not of λ), each $a \in S$ is ω -closed (i.e. $\text{cf}(\delta) = \aleph_0$ & $\delta = \sup(\delta \cap a) < \lambda \Rightarrow \delta \in a$) then for some $B \subseteq \lambda$, $|B| = \aleph_2$ and $S \cap \mathcal{S}_{<\aleph_2}(B)$ is stationary.

We shall show that it is very hard to get them (in a way defeating the application they have in mind: $\theta < \aleph_2$ follows from large cardinals). E.g. if μ is strong limit singular of cofinality $\aleph_0$, $2^\mu = \mu^+$ then $(*)_{\mu^+}$ is false.

Another question of Mekler and Eklof, improve somewhat [MgSh:204] showing in particular that if we have gotten in the (regular) λ, κ examples for incompactness then we can get one for $\lambda^{+(\kappa+1)}$.

To do this (see below) if $\lambda > \kappa^{+\kappa}$, we need a counterexample for λ , which without loss of generality is as in [Sh:161] canonical examples in which only cardinals in which examples exist appear (see below). For this we define when a set K of cardinals is nicely incompact and prove that the family of such sets is closed under the required operation.

2.1 Definition. A set K of regular cardinals is called nicely incompact if:

- (a) for each $\lambda \in K$ there is a λ -free not λ^+ -free abelian group or $\lambda = \aleph_0$
- (b) if λ is in K , $\kappa_1, \dots, \kappa_m \in K \cap \lambda$ then there is an example $\langle s_\eta^\ell : \eta \in \mathfrak{S}_f, \ell < m \rangle$ of incompactness (see [Sh:161, §3] or [Sh:521], we assume knowledge of e.g. [Sh:521, AP]) such that:

$$(\lambda_{<} = \lambda \text{ and) for some } \langle k_1, \dots, k_m \rangle \text{ we have} \\ \eta \in S \text{ \& } \ell g(\eta) = k_\ell \Rightarrow \lambda_\eta = \kappa_\ell.$$

2.2 Claim. 1) If K is nicely incompact, $\lambda = \max(K)$, λ regular then $K \cup \{\lambda^+\}$ is nicely incompact.

2) Assume $K = \{\lambda_i : i < \delta\}$ increasing and $j < \delta \Rightarrow \{\lambda_i : i \leq j\}$ nicely incompact. Then K is nicely incompact.

3) $\{\aleph_0\}$ is nicely incompact.

Proof. Easy.

Remark. If proof of 2.2(1) is not clear - read proof of 2.3 and throw away most (use $\{\delta < \lambda^+ : \text{cf}(\delta) = \lambda\}$ here instead $\{\delta \in A_g : \text{cf}(\delta) = \lambda'\}$ there).

2.3 Theorem. *If K is nicely incompact, $\chi, \kappa \in K$, K has no last element and $\chi^{+\kappa} \geq \sup(K)$ then $K \cup \{\chi^{+(\kappa+1)}\}$ is nicely incompact.*

Remark. By the closure properties 2.2(1), 2.2(2), 2.3 (and as a starting point 2.2(3): $\{\aleph_0\}$ being nicely incompact) we get a family of $\aleph_0$ cardinals which probably is the minimal set of incompactness.

Proof. If $\chi < \kappa = \aleph_\kappa$, then $\chi^{+(\kappa+1)} = \kappa^+$ and the desired conclusion holds is by Claim 2.2(1).

If $\chi < \kappa < \aleph_\kappa$ then $\chi^{+\kappa} = (\kappa^+)^{\kappa} = \aleph_\kappa$ so without loss of generality $\chi = \kappa^+$.

So without loss of generality $\chi \geq \kappa^+$, $\lambda = \chi^{+\kappa}$, $\mu = \lambda^+$, $\lambda > \kappa$ and J , $\langle \lambda_i : i < \kappa \rangle$, $\bar{f} = \langle f_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda \rangle$ be as in (*) of 1.5 and for simplicity $f_{\alpha_1}(i_1) = f_{\alpha_2}(i_2) \Rightarrow i_1 = i_2$, e.g. $f_\alpha(i) > \sum_{j < i} \lambda_j$; and let S^{gd}, S^{bd}, S^{ch} be from Definition 1.9. Remember that by 1.13, 1.14 we have

(*) if $x \in \{gd, wgd, ch\}$, $\delta \in S^x$ then for some club E of δ we have:
 $\alpha \in E$ & $\text{cf}(\alpha) \geq \kappa^+ \Rightarrow \alpha \in S^x$.

In the definition of “ K is nicely incompact” we have to check only for $\mu = \lambda^+$. Let $m < \omega$ and $\kappa_1, \dots, \kappa_m \in K \cap \lambda^+$. So $\langle \kappa_1, \dots, \kappa_m \rangle \in K \cap \chi^{+\kappa}$, without loss of generality $\kappa_1 < \kappa_2 < \dots < \kappa_m$.

Let $\lambda' \in K$ be such that $\kappa < \lambda, \chi < \lambda'$ and $\kappa_m < \lambda'$ (there is such a λ' as K has no last member).

Let $S = \{\delta \in S^{gd}(\bar{f}) : \text{cf}(\delta) = \lambda'\}$ (by 1.15 it is stationary) and for $\delta \in S$ choose $E_\delta \subseteq \delta$ an unbounded subset of order type λ' .

Let $E_\delta = \{\alpha_\zeta^\delta : \zeta < \lambda'\}$ (increasing).

Now choose an example for $\lambda' : \langle s_\eta^\ell : \eta \in \mathfrak{S}'_f \text{ and } \ell < n(*) \rangle, \mathfrak{S}'$ a λ' -set (see [Sh:161, §3] or [Sh:521, AP]), such that for some sequence $\langle k_1, \dots, k_n, k \rangle$ of natural number $\leq lg(\eta)$ for $\eta \in \mathfrak{S}'$

$$\begin{aligned} \eta \in \mathfrak{S}' \text{ \& } lg(\eta) = k_i &\Rightarrow \lambda_\eta = \kappa_\ell \\ \eta \in \mathfrak{S}' \text{ \& } lg(\eta) = k &\Rightarrow \lambda_\eta = \kappa. \end{aligned}$$

(possible by Definition 2.1).

Lastly, let

$$\mathfrak{S} = \{ \langle \rangle \} \cup \{ \langle \delta \rangle^\wedge \eta : \delta \in S \subseteq \lambda^+ \text{ and } \eta \in \mathfrak{S}' \}.$$

For $\eta \in \mathfrak{S}_f$ let (denoting $\delta = \eta(0)$ which necessarily is in S and letting $\eta = \langle \delta \rangle^\wedge \nu$ so $\nu = \eta \upharpoonright [1, lg(\eta))$):

$$s_\eta^{\ell+1} = (s_\nu^\ell \times \{\delta\}) \text{ if } \ell < n(*), \text{ and } s_\eta^0 = \left\{ \langle f_\delta(\eta(k)), \eta \upharpoonright [1, lg(\eta)), \alpha_{\eta(k)}^\delta \rangle : k < \omega \right\}.$$

$$A_\eta = \cup \{ s_\eta^\ell : \ell \leq n(*) \}$$

First note that $\langle A_\eta : \eta \in \mathfrak{S}_f \rangle$ has the right form hence has no one-to-one choice function (see [Sh:161, §3] or [Sh:521, AP]).

Secondly, to prove every subfamily of cardinality $< \mu$ has a one-to-one choice function it is enough to prove 2.6 below. It applies with λ', μ here standing for χ, μ^* there. The no reflection is by 2.4 below.

2.4 Observation. Let $\bar{\lambda}, J, \mu, \lambda$ be as in (*) of 1.5.

1) If J is θ -complete, $\lambda = \chi^{+\zeta}$, $\zeta \leq \theta$ a limit ordinal, $\text{cf}(\chi) > \kappa$, then:

- (i) $\delta \in S^{gd} \Rightarrow \{i < \kappa : \lambda_i^\delta \neq \text{cf}(\delta)\} \in J$
- (ii) $\delta \in S^{vbd} \Rightarrow \{i < \kappa : \lambda_i^\delta \neq \text{cf}(\delta)\} \in J$
- (iii) $\delta \in S^{wg} \Rightarrow \{i : \lambda_i^\delta \geq \chi, \lambda_i^\delta \neq \text{cf}(\delta)\} \in J$
- (iv) $\text{cf}(\delta) \geq \chi$ & $\delta \in S^{wg} \setminus S^{gd} \Rightarrow \{i < \kappa : \lambda_i^\delta \geq \chi \text{ and } \lambda_i^\delta = \text{cf}(\delta)\} \in J^+$.

2) If J is θ -complete, $\zeta \leq \theta$ (a limit ordinal) and $\lambda = \chi^{+\zeta}$ then for no $\delta \in S^{bd}$ do we have: $\{\alpha \in S^{gd} : \alpha < \delta, \text{cf}(\alpha) \geq \chi\}$ is stationary.

Proof. 1) Like 1.12.

2) Let δ be a counterexample, let f_δ^* be a $<_J$ -eub of $\bar{f} \upharpoonright \delta$ and by part (1) without loss of generality $s^* = \{i < \kappa : \lambda_i^\delta = \text{cf}[f_\delta^*(i)] < \chi\} \in J^+$. Choose $E_i \subseteq f_\delta^*(i)$ a club of order type λ_i^δ .

Choose $\langle \alpha_\zeta : \zeta < \text{cf}(\delta) \rangle$ is a strictly increasing sequence of ordinals with limit δ . Now we can choose by induction on $\zeta < \text{cf}(\delta)$ a pair (β_ζ, g_ζ) such that:

- (a) $g_\zeta \in \prod_{i < \kappa} E_i$ such that
 $\varepsilon < \zeta \Rightarrow f_{\beta_\varepsilon} \upharpoonright s^* <_J g_\zeta \upharpoonright s^*$
- (b) $\beta_\zeta \in \left(\bigcup_{\varepsilon < \zeta} \beta_\varepsilon \cup \alpha_\zeta, \delta \right)$ is such that $g_\zeta \upharpoonright s^* <_J f_{\beta_\zeta} \upharpoonright s^*$.

So if δ is a counterexample, then for some $\zeta < \text{cf}(\delta)$ we have: $\text{cf}(\zeta) \geq \chi$ and $\beta^* = \bigcup_{\varepsilon < \zeta} \beta_\varepsilon \in S^{gd}$. Hence there is an increasing sequence $\langle \gamma_j : j < \text{cf}(\beta^*) \rangle$ of

ordinals with limit β^* , and $t_j \in J$ for $j < \text{cf}(\beta^*)$ such that for each $i, \langle f_{\gamma_j}(i) : j < \text{cf}(\beta^*), i \notin t_j \rangle$ is strictly increasing. For each $i \in s^*$ there is $j(i) < \text{cf}(\beta^*)$ such that all the ordinals $\{f_{\gamma_j}(i) : j(i) \leq j < \text{cf}(\beta^*) \text{ and } i \notin t_j\}$ realize the same Dedekind cut of E_i . Let $j^* = \sup_{i < \kappa} j(i) < \text{cf}(\beta^*)$ (as $\text{cf}(\beta^*) \geq \text{cf}(\chi) > \kappa$). Now the contradiction should be clear. $\square_{2.4}$

2.5 Remark. 1) Alternatively, in the proof of 2.3 redefine $S^{ch}(\bar{f})$ replacing “ $|s_i| \leq \kappa$ ” by “ $|s_i| \leq \chi$ ”. We call it $S_\chi^{ch}(\bar{f})$ (similarly the others).

2) Note: if λ belongs to some nicely incompact K^* , then there is a finite nicely incompact $K \subseteq K^*$ to which λ belongs.

2.6 Claim. *In the context of (*) of 1.5, suppose $\kappa < \chi = \text{cf}(\chi) < \mu^* \leq \mu$ and $S \subseteq \{\delta \in S^{gd} : \text{cf}(\delta) = \chi\}$ is stationary but reflect in no $\delta \in S^{bd}$ of cofinality $< \mu^*$ and $f_{\alpha_1}(i_1) = f_{\alpha_2}(i_2) \Rightarrow i_1 = i_2$ (e.g. $f_\alpha(i) > \sup_{j < i} \lambda_j$). For $\delta \in S$ let E_δ be an unbounded subset of δ . Let $A_\delta = E_\delta \times (\text{Rang } f_\delta) \subseteq \delta \times \lambda$. Then $\langle A_\delta : \delta \in S \rangle$ has no one-to-one choice function but is μ^* -free in the following sense:*

- (*) if $B \subseteq S$, $|B| < \mu^*$ then we can find $\alpha_\delta < \delta$ and $s_\delta \in J$ for $\delta \in B$ such that the sets $\langle (E_\delta \setminus \alpha_\delta) \times \text{Rang } (f_\delta \upharpoonright (\kappa \setminus s_\delta)) : \delta \in B \rangle$ are pairwise disjoint.

Remark. 1) When we use it in 2.3, $\mu^* = \mu$ and the non-reflection is guaranteed by 2.4.

2) If we want to replace A_δ by a subset of δ , assume every $\delta \in S$ is divisible by λ^2 , and every $\alpha \in E_\delta$ is divisible by λ , and let

$$A_\delta = \{\alpha_\zeta^\delta + f_\delta(i) : i < \kappa, \theta < \chi\} \text{ where } S_\delta = \{\alpha_\zeta^\delta : \zeta < \chi\} \text{ (increasing)}.$$

3) If $J = J_\kappa^{bd}$ it may look nicer to assume $\langle \text{Rang } f_\alpha \upharpoonright [i, \kappa) : \alpha \in E_\delta \rangle$ (for suitable $i = i_\delta < \kappa$) are pairwise disjoint (not hard to get as $\delta \in S^{gd}$). Then use $f_\alpha \upharpoonright [i, \kappa)$ only.

4) It seems reasonable to demand (and it causes no problem) $i < \kappa$ & $\alpha < \mu \Rightarrow f_\alpha(i) > \sup\{f_\beta(j) : j < i, \beta < \mu\}$.

Proof. This is proved by induction on $\cup\{\delta + 1 : \delta \in B\}$.

Without loss of generality $B \neq \emptyset$.

Case 1. B has a last element $\delta(*)$.

By the induction hypothesis there are $\langle (\alpha_\delta^1, s_\delta^1) : \delta \in B \setminus \{\delta(*)\} \rangle$ as required for $B \setminus \{\delta(*)\}$. For each $\delta \in B \cap \delta(*)$ we have $t_\delta = \{i < \kappa : f_\delta(i) \geq f_{\delta(*)}(i)\} \in J$. Let us define for $\delta \in B$:

$$\alpha_\delta = \begin{cases} \alpha_\delta^1 & \text{if } \delta \in B, \delta \neq \delta(*) \\ 0 & \text{if } \delta = \delta(*) \end{cases}$$

$$s_\delta = \begin{cases} s_\delta \cup t_\delta & \text{if } \delta \in B, \delta \neq \delta(*) \\ \emptyset & \text{if } \delta = \delta(*). \end{cases}$$

Case 2. B has no last element, $\delta(*) = \sup(B)$ has cofinality $\leq \chi$.

Let $\langle \gamma_\zeta : \zeta < \text{cf}(\delta(*)) \rangle$ be increasing continuous sequence with limit $\delta(*)$, $\gamma_0 = 0$ and $\text{cf}(\gamma_\zeta) \neq \chi$, hence $\gamma_\zeta \notin S$. For each ζ , apply the induction hypothesis to $B_\zeta =: B \cap (\gamma_\zeta, \gamma_{\zeta+1})$ and get $\langle (\alpha_\delta^\zeta, s_\delta) : \delta \in B_\zeta \rangle$.

We let for $\delta \in B$ (note: B is the disjoint union of B_ζ for $\zeta < \chi$):

$$\alpha_\delta = \text{Max}\{\alpha_\delta^\zeta, \gamma_\zeta\} \text{ for } \delta \in B_\zeta$$

$$s_\delta = s_\delta^\zeta \text{ for } \delta \in B_\zeta.$$

Easy to check that they are as required.

Case 3. B has no last element, $\delta(*) = \sup(B)$ has cofinality $> \chi$ and S^{gd} (hence S) does not reflect in $\delta(*)$.

Same proof as Case 2.

Case 4. B has no last element, $\delta(*) = \sup(B)$ has cofinality $> \chi$ and S^{gd} reflects in $\delta(*)$.

As $|B| < \mu^*$, clearly $cf(\delta(*)) < \mu^*$ hence (by assumption) $\delta(*) \notin S^{bd}$. Also $\delta(*) \notin S^{ch}$ (by 1.14 as: $S^{gd} \cap \delta(*)$ is stationary and $S^{gd} \cap S^{ch} = \emptyset$ (which holds by 1.11)). So $\delta(*) \in S^{gd}$, hence we can find $\langle \gamma_{\zeta+1} : \zeta < cf(\delta(*)) \rangle$ increasing with limit $\delta(*)$, and $s_\zeta \in J$ for $\zeta < cf(\delta(*))$ be such that:

$$\begin{aligned} (*) \quad & i < \kappa \ \& \ \zeta < \xi < cf(\delta(*)) \ \& \ i \notin s_\zeta \cup s_\xi \Rightarrow f_{\gamma_\zeta}(i) < f_{\gamma_\xi}(i) \\ (**) \quad & \gamma_\zeta \in S \Rightarrow cf(\zeta) = \chi. \end{aligned}$$

For limit $\zeta < cf(\delta(*))$ let $\gamma_\zeta =: \bigcup_{\xi < \zeta} \gamma_{\xi+1}$ and let $\gamma_0 = 0$.

Now if $\zeta < cf(\delta(*))$ is limit and $\gamma_\zeta \in S$ (so $cf(\zeta) = \chi$), let

$$t_\zeta^0 =: \{i : \text{for arbitrarily large } \xi < \zeta, i \in \kappa \setminus s_{\xi+1} \text{ and } f_{\gamma_{\xi+1}}(i) \geq f_{\gamma_\zeta}(i)\}$$

now t_ζ^0 is in J [otherwise, for each $i \in t_\zeta^0$ let $Y_\zeta^i = \{\xi < \zeta : i \in \kappa \setminus s_{\xi+1} \text{ and } f_{\gamma_{\xi+1}}(i) \geq f_{\gamma_\zeta}(i)\}$ by the choice of $\langle s_{\xi+1} : \xi < cf(\delta(*)) \rangle$, clearly

$$\xi_1 < \xi_2 < \zeta \ \& \ \xi_1 \in Y_\zeta^i \ \& \ i \in \kappa \setminus s_{\xi_2} \Rightarrow \xi_2 \in Y_\zeta^i.$$

Let $\xi(i) \leq \zeta$ be $\text{Min}(Y_\zeta^i \cup \{\zeta\})$, and $\xi(*) = \text{Min}\{\xi(i) : i < \kappa, \xi(i) < \zeta\}$, now $\xi(*) < \zeta$ as $cf(\zeta) = \chi > \kappa$; and look at what occurs for $\xi = \xi(*) + 1$.

Let $t_\xi^1 = \{i : \text{for every large enough } \xi < \zeta, i \notin s_{\xi+1}\}$. Again easily $t_\xi^1 \in J$. Lastly let $t_\xi^2 = \{i : f_{\gamma_\xi}(i) \geq f_{\gamma_{\xi+1}}(i)\}$ now as $\gamma_\xi < \gamma_{\xi+1}$ clearly $t_\xi^2 \in J$ and $t_\zeta^3 = s_{\zeta+1} \in J$.

Now for each $\zeta < cf(\delta(*))$, $B_\zeta =: B \cap (\gamma_\zeta, \gamma_{\zeta+1})$ satisfies the induction hypothesis, hence we have $\langle (\alpha_\delta^\zeta, s_\delta^\zeta) : \delta \in B_\zeta \rangle$ as required.

Notice that B is partitioned to B_ζ (for $\zeta < cf(\delta(*))$) and $\{\gamma_\zeta : \zeta \text{ limit} < cf(\delta(*))\} \cap S$. We define

$$\alpha_\delta = \begin{cases} \text{Max}\{\alpha_\delta^\zeta, \gamma_\zeta\} & \text{if } \delta \in B_\zeta, \zeta < cf(\delta(*)) \\ 0 & \text{if } \delta \in \{\gamma_\zeta : \zeta \text{ limit}\} \cap S \end{cases}$$

for $\zeta < cf(\delta(*))$ and $\delta \in B_\zeta$ let

$$t_{\zeta, \delta} = s_\zeta \cup s_{\zeta+1} \cup \{i < \kappa : \neg[f_{\gamma_\zeta}(i) < f_\delta(i) < f_{\gamma_{\zeta+1}}(i)]\} \in J$$

$$s_\delta = \begin{cases} s_\delta^\zeta \cup t_{\delta,\zeta} & \text{if } \delta \in B_\zeta, \zeta < \text{cf}(\delta(*)) \\ t_\zeta^0 \cup t_\zeta^1 \cup t_\zeta^2 \cup t_\zeta^3 & \text{if } \delta = \gamma_\zeta, \zeta < \text{cf}(\delta(*)) \text{ limit}, \delta \in B(\subseteq S) \end{cases}$$

It is easy to check that $\langle (\alpha_\delta, s_\delta) : \delta \in B \rangle$ is as required: let $\delta_1, \delta_2 \in B$ be distinct, without loss of generality $\delta_1 < \delta_2$, now

Case 1: If $\delta_1, \delta_2 \in B_\zeta$ for some ζ ; then use the choice of $\langle \alpha_{\delta_1}^\zeta, s_{\delta_1}^\zeta \rangle, \langle \alpha_{\delta_2}^\zeta, s_{\delta_2}^\zeta \rangle$.

Case 2: If $\delta_1 \in B_{\zeta_1}, \delta_2 \in B_{\zeta_2}, \zeta_1 \neq \zeta_2$ then note $\alpha_{\delta_2} \geq \gamma_{\zeta_2}$.

Case 3: If $\delta_1, \delta_2 \in \{\gamma_\zeta : \zeta < \text{cf}(\delta(*))\} \cap S$, then let $\delta_1 = \gamma_{\zeta_1}, \delta_2 = \gamma_{\zeta_2}$ hence by $(**)$ we have $\zeta_1 + 1 < \zeta_2$, so $i \in \kappa \setminus t_{\zeta_1}^2 \Rightarrow f_{\gamma_{\zeta_1}}(i) < f_{\gamma_{\zeta_1}+1}(i)$ and $i \in \kappa \setminus t_\zeta^3 \setminus t_\zeta^0 \setminus t_\zeta^1 \Rightarrow f_{\gamma_{\zeta_1}+1}(i) < f_{\gamma_{\zeta_2}}(i)$ so the conclusion is easy.

Case 4: If $\delta_2 \in B_{\zeta_2}, \delta_1 \in \{\gamma_\zeta : \zeta < \text{cf}(\delta(*))\} \cap S$ then use $\alpha_{\delta_2} \geq \gamma_{\zeta_2}$.

Case 5: If $\delta_1 \in B_{\zeta_1}, \delta_2 = \gamma_{\zeta_2} \in \{\gamma_\zeta : \zeta < \text{cf}(\delta(*))\} \cap S$ then $\zeta_2 \geq \zeta_1$ hence by $(**)$ we have $\zeta_2 > \zeta_1 + 1$, hence $i \in \kappa \setminus s_{\zeta_1+1} \setminus t_{\zeta_2}^0 \setminus t_{\zeta_2}^1 \Rightarrow f_{\gamma_{\zeta_1}+1}(i) < f_{\gamma_{\zeta_2}}(i)$ hence $i \in \kappa \setminus s_{\delta_1} \setminus s_{\delta_2} \Rightarrow i \in \kappa \setminus t_{\zeta,\delta} \setminus s_{\zeta_1+1} \setminus t_{\zeta_2}^0 \setminus t_{\zeta_2}^1 \Rightarrow f_{\delta_1}(i) < f_{\gamma_{\zeta_1}+1}(i) < f_{\delta_2}(i)$. $\square_{2.6}$

2.7 Conclusion. Suppose $\text{cf}(\lambda) = \kappa < \lambda, \kappa < \chi = \text{cf}(\chi) < \lambda$. Then there is a stationary $S \subseteq \{\delta < \lambda^+ : \text{cf}(\delta) = \chi\}$ and $\langle A_\delta : \delta \in S \rangle$ such that:

- (α) $A_\delta = \left\{ \alpha_{i,\zeta}^\delta : i < \chi, \zeta < \kappa \right\} \subseteq \delta$
- (β) $\alpha_{i_1,\zeta_1}^{\delta_1} = \alpha_{i_2,\zeta_2}^{\delta_2} \Rightarrow i_1 = i_2 \ \& \ \zeta_1 = \zeta_2$
- (γ) for each $\delta \in S$, $\zeta < \kappa$ we have $\bigwedge_\gamma$ [the sequence $\langle \alpha_{i,\zeta} : i < \chi \rangle$ is increasing with limit δ]
- (δ) $\langle A_\delta : \delta \in S \rangle$ is $\chi^{+\kappa+1}$ -free in the strong sense of 2.6; i.e. if $E \subseteq S, |E| \leq \chi^{+\kappa}$ then we can find $\langle \langle i_\delta, \zeta_\delta \rangle : \delta \in E \rangle$ such that:
 - (a) $i_\delta < \chi, \zeta_\delta < \kappa$
 - (b) the sets $A'_\delta = \{\alpha_{i_\delta,\zeta_\delta}^\delta : \zeta_\delta < \zeta < \kappa \text{ and } i_\delta < i < \chi\}$ (for $\delta \in E$) are pairwise disjoint.

Proof. Combine the previous claims.

(Note: λ necessarily is $\geq \chi^{+\kappa+1}$ but can be strictly bigger).

2.8 Conclusion. 1) If $\lambda > \text{cf}(\lambda) = \kappa, \kappa < \chi = \text{cf}(\chi) < \lambda$, then we can find a stationary $S \subseteq \{\delta < \lambda^+ : \text{cf}(\delta) = \chi\}$ and $A_\delta \subseteq \delta = \sup(A_\delta), |A_\delta| = \chi$ for $\delta \in S$, such that:

- (*) if $B \subseteq S, |B| \leq \chi^{+\kappa}$ then $\{A_\delta : \delta \in B\}$ has a one-to-one choice function.

- 2) If in (1) $\diamond_S$ holds, without loss of generality $\{A_\delta : \delta \in S\}$ is a stationary subset of $\mathcal{S}_{<\chi}(\lambda^+)$ each A_δ is ω -closed (and even $<\chi$ -closed).
 3) $\diamond_S$ holds if $2^\lambda = \lambda^+$ & $\lambda \geq \beth_\omega$ (also if $\lambda < \beth_\omega$ this is normally O.K.).
 4) Condition (*) of (1) implies that for no $A^* \subseteq \lambda$ of power $\leq \chi^{+\kappa}$, is $\{A_\delta : A_\delta \subseteq A^*\}$ a stationary subset of $\mathcal{S}_{<\chi^+}(A^*)$.

Proof. 1) By 2.7.

2) We can replace A_δ by any A'_δ , $A_\delta \subseteq A'_\delta \subseteq \delta$, $|A'_\delta| = \chi$, and preserve the conclusion of (1); by $\diamond_S$ we can do it as to get stationary set.

3) By [Sh:460] (see more there).

4) Check. $\square_{2.7}$

2.9 Observation. Suppose $\text{cf}(\lambda) = \kappa < \lambda$ and there is $\langle A_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda^+ \rangle$, $A_\alpha \in [\lambda]^\kappa$, such that:

for each $\beta < \lambda^+$ we can find $\langle A'_\alpha : \alpha < \beta \rangle$ pairwise disjoint with
 $A'_\alpha \subseteq A_\alpha$ & $|A_\alpha \setminus A'_\alpha| < \kappa$.

Then:

- (A) for every regular $\chi \in (\kappa, \lambda)$ we can find
 $\langle \langle \alpha_{i,\zeta}^\delta : i < \chi, \zeta < \kappa \rangle : \delta < \lambda^+, \text{cf}(\delta) = \chi \rangle$ as in 2.7, λ^+ -free, in 2.6's sense;
 i.e. see clause (δ) of 2.7.
 (B) If K is a nicely incompact set, $\kappa = \max(K)$, $\lambda \geq \sup(K)$ and then
 $K \cup \{\lambda^+\}$ is nicely incompact.

Proof. Trivial. For (A) just replace every ordinal of $< \lambda$ by χ ordinals; and copy them on each interval $[\lambda\alpha, \lambda\alpha + \lambda)$. Also (B) is immediate. $\square_{2.9}$

2.10 Conclusion. If $\kappa = \text{cf}(\lambda) < \lambda$ and $pp_{\Gamma(\kappa)}(\lambda) > \lambda^+$ then the assumption of 2.9 hence the conclusions of 2.9 and 2.7 holds.

Proof. By [Sh:355, 1.6(2)] the assumptions of 2.9 holds.

§3 NPT IS NOT NECESSARILY TRANSITIVE

3.1 Lemma. *Assume the consistency of $ZFC +$ “there are two weakly compact cardinals $> \aleph_0$ ”. Then it is consistent with ZFC that for some regular $\lambda > \mu > \aleph_0$, $NPT(\lambda, \mu) + NPT(\mu, \aleph_0)$ does not imply $NPT(\lambda, \aleph_0)$; (i.e. in some generic extension of universe V this holds provided that $V \models “\aleph_0 < \kappa < \lambda$, κ and λ are weakly compact”).*

3.2 Remark. We give more specific information in the three cases below.

Proof. First assume $\kappa < \mu < \lambda$ are such that:

- (*) (1) $PT(\kappa, \aleph_0)$, κ regular
- (2) $NPT(\mu, \aleph_0)$, (μ regular)
- (3) $PT(\lambda, \aleph_0)$, $\lambda = \lambda^{<\lambda}$, even if we add a Cohen subset to λ
- (4) $\lambda \in I[\lambda]$ (see on it and references in the discussion after 2.2; if λ is strongly inaccessible or $\lambda = \chi^+$ & $\chi = \chi^{<\chi}$ this always holds).

(So all three are regular uncountable cardinals).

Shoot a non-reflecting stationary subset $\tilde{S}$ of $\{\delta < \lambda : cf(\delta) = \kappa\}$ by the forcing notion

$$Q_0 = \left\{ h : h \text{ a function from } (\alpha + 1) \text{ to } \{0, 1\}, \alpha < \lambda, \right. \\ \left. [\delta \leq \alpha \ \& \ h(\delta) = 1 \Rightarrow cf(\delta) = \kappa], \right. \\ \left. h^{-1}(\{1\}) \text{ is non-reflecting} \right\}.$$

In V^{Q_0} no bounded subset of λ is added (so $NPT(\mu, \aleph_0)$, $PT(\kappa, \aleph_0)$ continue to hold). Also trivially $NPT(\lambda, \kappa)$ hence $NPT(\lambda, \mu)$ (as $\mu \geq \kappa$, e.g. for $\delta \in \tilde{S}$ choose $A_\delta \subseteq \delta$, $|A_\delta| = otp(A_\delta) = \kappa$, $\sup(A_\delta) = \delta$).

So it is enough to prove $PT(\lambda, \aleph_0)$. If not, there is a λ -set $\mathfrak{S}$ and $\{A_\eta : \eta \in \mathfrak{S}_f\}$ witnessing it as in [Sh:161, §3] or see [Sh:521, AP]. As $PT(\kappa, \aleph_0)$ (also in V^Q) we have $\eta \in S \Rightarrow \lambda_\eta \neq \kappa$, hence (see [Sh:161, §3] or [Sh:521, AP])

$$(*) \quad \langle i \rangle \in S \Rightarrow cf(i) \neq \kappa.$$

So if we kill the stationary set $\tilde{S}$ by a forcing notion

$$Q_1 = \{g : g \text{ a function for } \alpha + 1 < \lambda \text{ to } \{0, 1\}, h^{-1}(\{1\}) \text{ closed disjoint to } \tilde{S}\}, \text{ then}$$

in the universe $(V^{Q_0})^{\tilde{Q}_1}$, still $NPT(\lambda, \aleph_0)$ by the same example.

[Why? The set $S = \{i < \lambda : \langle i \rangle \in \mathfrak{S}\}$ is stationary (as $\mathfrak{S}$ is a λ -set). Now (see [Sh:88, AP]) the set S is in $I[\lambda]$ in V^Q (as λ is) and is stationary and disjoint to $\tilde{S}_0$ hence is stationary also in $(V^{Q_0})^{\tilde{Q}_1}$, and no bounded subset of λ is added.]

But $Q_0 * \underset{\sim}{Q_1}$ is just adding a Cohen subset of λ hence by $(*)$ (3) we know $(V^{Q_0})^{\underset{\sim}{*}Q_1} \models PT(\lambda, \aleph_0)$. So we have gotten an example as required in the lemma, provided we start with a universe satisfying $(*)$. So when $(*)$ holds?

Case 1. λ supercompact, κ first measurable, choose any μ such that $\kappa < \mu < \lambda$, $\mu = \text{cf}(\mu)$, we can add to μ a set $S \subseteq \{\delta < \mu : \text{cf}(\delta) = \aleph_0\}$ stationary non-reflecting and then make λ Laver indestructible by forcing notions not adding subsets of λ . So G.C.H. is O.K.

Case 2 (Small Cardinals). By the forcing in [MgSh:204] (but for λ regular adding λ -Cohen sets) the following case is O.K.

$$GCH + \kappa = \aleph_{\omega^2+1} + \mu = \aleph_{\omega_1+1} + \lambda = \aleph_{\omega_1+\omega^2+1}.$$

Case 3. $V = L$, $\kappa < \lambda$ are uncountable weakly compact cardinals in L , $\mu = \kappa^+$, P is a μ^+ -complete forcing notion making $(*)$ (3) hold without adding any subset to μ . (E.g. P is P_λ , where $\langle P_i, \underset{\sim}{Q_j} : i \leq \lambda, j < \lambda \rangle$ is an iteration with Easton support, λ_j -the j th inaccessible cardinal in L which is $> \kappa$, Q_j is the λ_j -Cohen forcing in V^{P_j} ; i.e.

$Q_j = \{h : h \text{ a function from some } \alpha < \lambda_j \text{ to } \lambda_j \text{ in } V^{P_j}\}$.

Now in V^P , κ, μ, λ are as required. $\square_{3.1}$

By work of Jensen there is a non-reflecting stationary $S \subseteq \lambda$ for λ regular non weakly compact

REFERENCES.

- [EM] P. Eklof and A. Mekler. *Almost free modules; Set theoretic methods*. North Holland Library, 1990.
- [MgSh 204] Menachem Magidor and Saharon Shelah. When does almost free imply free? (For groups, transversal etc.). *Journal of the American Mathematical Society*, **accepted**.
- [Sh 521] Saharon Shelah. If there is an exactly λ -free abelian group then there is a λ -separable one. *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, **to appear**.
- [Sh 460] Saharon Shelah. The Generalized Continuum Hypothesis revisited. *Israel Journal of Mathematics*, **submitted**.
- [Sh 108] Saharon Shelah. On successors of singular cardinals. In *Logic Colloquium '78 (Mons, 1978)*, volume 97 of *Stud. Logic Foundations Math*, pages 357–380. North-Holland, Amsterdam-New York, 1979.
- [Sh 161] Saharon Shelah. Incompactness in regular cardinals. *Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic*, **26**:195–228, 1985.
- [Sh 88] Saharon Shelah. Classification of nonelementary classes. II. Abstract elementary classes. In *Classification theory (Chicago, IL, 1985)*, volume 1292 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, pages 419–497. Springer, Berlin, 1987. Proceedings of the USA–Israel Conference on Classification Theory, Chicago, December 1985; ed. Baldwin, J.T.
- [Sh 345] Saharon Shelah. Products of regular cardinals and cardinal invariants of products of Boolean algebras. *Israel Journal of Mathematics*, **70**:129–187, 1990.
- [Sh 420] Saharon Shelah. Advances in Cardinal Arithmetic. In *Finite and Infinite Combinatorics in Sets and Logic*, pages 355–383. Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1993. N.W. Sauer et al (eds.).
- [Sh 355] Saharon Shelah. $\aleph_{\omega+1}$ has a Jonsson Algebra. In *Cardinal Arithmetic*, volume 29 of *Oxford Logic Guides*, chapter II. Oxford University Press, 1994.
- [Sh:g] Saharon Shelah. *Cardinal Arithmetic*, volume 29 of *Oxford Logic Guides*. Oxford University Press, 1994.